

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01851 041406Z

71

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-07 OMB-01 ACDA-19 DRC-01 ( ISO ) W

----- 091366

R 041315Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5014

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3853

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1851

E.O. 11652: GDS 80

TAGS: MCAP NATO

SUBJECT: DPC MEETING 3 APRIL 1974, ITEM IV: OTHER BUSINESS-  
INFRASTRUCTURE CEILING AND COST SHARING FOR 1975-1979

REFS: A. STATE 50573

B. USNATO 1673

C. STATE 65387

SUMMARY. RUMSFELD'S INTERVENTION REQUESTING LIBERAL NATIONAL  
CONSIDERATION FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM CEILING ON ORDER OF  
IAU 600 MILLION WAS WARMLY ENDORSED BY ADMIRAL MINTER,  
DEPUTY MILITARY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN. MOST ALLIES, WITH NOTABLE  
EXCEPTION OF UK, INDICATED POSITIVE APPROACH WOULD BE TAKEN  
IN THEIR CAPITALS.  
END SUMMARY.

1. UNDER OTHER BUSINESS, RUMSFELD NOTED US CONCERN WITH  
POSSIBLE LOW INFRASTRUCTURE CEILING FOR 1975-79 PERIOD AS  
FOLLOWS:  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01851 041406Z

QUOTE I HAVE SENT A LETTER TO MEMBERS OF THE DPC INDICATING  
A SERIOUS CONCERN OF MY AUTHORITIES. IN OUR VIEW THE  
CURRENT NATO COMMITTEE ACTIONS WILL NOT LEAD TO THE PROVISION  
OF SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM. NATO,

OF COURSE, CONSISTS OF A COLLECTION OF INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL DEFENSE EFFORTS WHICH ARE INTENDED TO FUNCTION TOGETHER IN TIME OF CRISIS OR WAR. DURING PEACETIME AND IN PERIODS OF RELAXATION, THERE IS LITTLE WHICH IS INTEGRATED IN NATO. IT IS NOT UNFAIR TO SAY THAT THOSE PEACETIME INTEGRATED ITEMS ARE LIMITED TO SEVERAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS AND STAFFS DOING PLANNING FOR AN EVENTUAL INTEGRATION, AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES FACILITIES TO INTEGRATE OUR EVENTUAL DEFENSE EXRT. WITHOUT THESE FACILITIES, OUR COLLECTIVE DEFENSE POSTURE CERTAINLY MUST SUFFER.

IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS, WE HAVE DEVOTED THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE RELATED EUROPEAN DEFENSE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, SOME 455 MILLION IAU TO THE PROVISION OF SUCH INTEGRATED FACILITIES AS NICS, AIR DEFENSE, POL PIPELINES AND STORAGE, ETC. IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN THAT LEVEL OF EFFORT IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, GIVEN SOME 30 PCT INFLATION IN THE INTERIM, WE WOULD NEED A PROGRAM OF APPROXIMATELY 600 MILLION IAU. NEVERTHELESS, NATO SEEMS HEADED TOWARD A CEILING AS LOW AS 300 MILLION IAU FOR THE COMING PERIOD. THIS WOULD REQUIRE US TO FOREGO A LARGE PROPORTION OF THE MINIMUM FACILITIES REQUIRED TO INTEGRATE OUR FORCES IN WARTIME. EVEN AT THE LARGEST PROGRAM MENTIONED IN THE CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY (AC/4-WP/518) OF 400 MILLION IAU, THE DPC WOULD BE ENDORSING SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION RANGING FROM 20 TO 80 PERCENT OF SUCH FACILITIES FROM PRIORITY "A" REQUESTS OF THE MNCS: REDUCTIONS WOULD BE IN AIRFIELD RESTORATION, AIRFIELD MODIFICATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR NEW AIRCRAFT, AIRFIELD PROTECTION IN THAT WE WOULD NOT BUILD THE SHELTERS FOR RAPID REACTION AIRCRAFT TO WHICH OUR MINISTERS AGREED IN DECEMBER, RECEPTION FACILITIES, WAR HEADQUARTERS, NICS, OTHER COMMUNICATIONS, FORWARD STORAGE SITES, FLEET FACILITIES, TACTICAL AIR CONTROL, AND AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE ABOVE REDUCTIONS ARE THOSE WHICH WE WOULD BE ENDORSING IF WE AGREED TO A PROGRAM OF 400 MILLION  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01851 041406Z

IAU INSTEAD OF 600 MILLION IAU. THE LIST IS SOMEWHAT DRAMATIC WHEN VIEWED AS COMPRISING THE FACILITIES WE REQUIRE TO INTEGRATE AND SUPPORT OUR SEPARATE NATIONAL FORCES IN TIME OF WAR. OF COURSE, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT SOME OF OUR ALLIES MAY HAVE DECIDED TO PROVIDE SUCH FACILITIES FROM THEIR OWN BUDGETS, BUT I HAVEN'T HEARD THAT IS THE CASE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, ONE THOUGHT THAT OCCURS TO ME AFTER EXAMINING THE ABOVE LIST IS THE DIFFICULTY I WOULD HAVE IN EXPLAINING IN THIS 25TH YEAR OF NATO, THAT NATO HAD DECIDED TO REDUCE ITS ANNUAL INTEGRATING EFFORTS BY SOME 50 PCT IN REAL VALUE BELOW THE CURRENT LEVEL.

FINALLY, MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD BE INTERESTED IN HEARING

THE MILITARY COMMITTEE VIEWS ON THE IMPACT OF A 50 PCT IN REAL TERM REDUCTION IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM ON NATO FORCE GOALS AND OUR INTEGRATED NATO DEFENSE POSTURE. I WOULD HOPE THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE DPC WOULD COMMUNICATE THE US VIEWS AND THOSE OF THE NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES TO THEIR OWN AUTHORITIES BEFORE FINAL POSITIONS ARE TAKEN ON THE CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY SET FORTH IN AC/4-WP/518 UNQUOTE.

2. CHAIRMAN PANSA, DEPUTY SYG, NOTED SYG'S CONCERN OVER POSSIBILITY OF LOW INFRASTRUCTURE CEILING AND REQUESTED ASSESSMENT BY ADMIRAL MINTER. MINTER STATED THAT THE MILITARY COMMITTEE HAD BEEN CONSISTENT IN THEIR STATEMENT OF CONCERN THAT THE NATIONS WOULD NOT SUPPORT THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM WITH SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT NATO'S MOST PRESSING NEED FOR FACILITIES. HE REFERRED TO ITEM II ON DPC AGENDA CONCERNING THE LESSONS FROM THE MIDDLE EAST WAR WHICH HAD REVEALED MANY SHORTCOMINGS IN NATO'S INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES AND PARTICULARLY SINGLED OUT AIRCRAFT SHELTERS. HE BELIEVED THAT REDUCTION TO IAU 400 MILLION FOR THE 1975-79 PERIOD WOULD LEAVE NATO WITH A SEVERE SHORTAGE OF ESSENTIAL FACILITIES.

3. DE STAERCKE, BELGIUM, INDICATED THAT BOTH RUMSFELD'S LETTER AND HIS STATEMENT HAD CONVINCED HIM (DE STAERCKE) AND THAT HE WAS SURE THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD RELAX CONSIDERABLY THEIR PREVIOUSLY RESTRICTIVE POSITION ON THE MATTER OF THE CEILING. CHORAFAS, GREECE, AND ERALP, TURKEY, INDICATED  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01851 041406Z

SUPPORT FOR A CEILING AS HIGH AS POSSIBLE UP TO THE MILITARY PRIORITY A REQUIREMENTS OF IAU 600 MILLION. BUSCH, NORWAY, AND CATALANO, ITALY, INDICATED SUPPORT OF ABOUT IAU 450 MILLION. SVART, DENMARK, AND HOSTERT, LUXEMBOURG, STATED THAT THEIR COUNTRIES WOULD RAISE THEIR PREVIOUS LIMITS. HARTOGH, NETHERLANDS, INDICATED CURRENT POSITION OF IAU 400 MILLION OR MORE. MENZIES, CANADA, STATED THAT THEIR POSITION HAD BEEN LIBERALIZED QTE TO AS MUCH AS IAU 300 MILLION UNQTE (CANADIAN INFRASTRUCTURE REP INDICATES THAT THIS FIGURE IS FOR NEGOTIATING PURPOSES AND THAT THERE IS CONSIDERABLY MORE FLEXIBILITY IN THEIR INSTRUCTIONS-PROTECT.)

4. PANSA SUMMED UP WITH REQUEST THAT US POSITION AND THAT OF THE NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES BE COMMUNICATED BY PERM REPS TO THEIR AUTHORITIES IN AN EFFORT TO SECURE SUPPORT FOR A REALISTICALLY HIGH INFRASTRUCTURE CEILING. ABSENCE OF UK INTERVENTION, WHILE NOT MENTIONED BY ANYONE, WAS VERY APPARENT. UK WOULD APPEAR TO BE ISOLATED AT THE IAU 300 MILLION LEVEL NOW THAT BELGIUM HAS TAKEN A MORE LIBERAL POSITION.  
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 04 APR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO01851  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS 80  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740482/abbryuei.tel  
**Line Count:** 162  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. STATE 50573 B. USNATO 1673 C. STATE 65387  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 09 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <09 APR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <04-Sep-2002 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** DPC MEETING 3 APRIL 1974, ITEM IV: OTHER BUSINESS- INFRASTRUCTURE      CEILING AND COST SHARING FOR 1975-1979  
**TAGS:** MCAP NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE  
USLOSACLANT  
CINCLANT  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005